

SUBJECT No. 99.

A shanbhog to each circle.

Messrs. Channabasappa Gowda, Sorab Taluk; M. Venkataramaiya and M. Ranganna, Manjara-bad Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—This rule causes much hardship in two ways. An original shanbhogi circle which was sufficient to maintain a family has now been divided into three or four circles, and the potgi realised from any one of them is too small to maintain even a single individual. The appointment of gumastas for circles other than those of which the shanbhogi duties are performed by the registered shanbhog not only deprives him of his means of subsistence but does not enable the gumastas to maintain themselves either. Further in the thinly populated and unhealthy regions of the malnad, competent gumastas are not available. It is therefore prayed that this rule may be so modified as to enable competent persons to look after the shanbhogi duties of more than one circle so that they may be able to maintain themselves suitably.

Reply of Government.—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 100.

Potgi to Patels and Shanbhogs.

Mr. Channabasappa Gowda, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The work of patels and shanbhogs is increasing day by day. The potgi that several of them get at present does not suffice for their maintenance. It is therefore prayed that, as in the Bombay Presidency, the scales of potgi for shanbhogs and patels may be fixed at five and four per cent, respectively, on the revenue of the villages in their charge.

Reply of Government.—The rates cannot be increased as already stated last year.

SUBJECT No. 101.

(a) Remuneration to *totis* and *talaris*.(b) A *toti* and a *talavar* for each patel.

(a) Messrs. Shroff Puttanna Chetty, Rumale Rudrappa, Kolar Ramappa, Doddballapur Taluk; Tnbigere Chendrasekharappa, Doddballapur Municipality; Agali Venkataramaiya, Sira Taluk; Adeppa, Tumkur Taluk; Hutchvire Gowda, Gubbi Taluk; H. Gundappa and Ramanujiengar, Kunigal Taluk; Abidalli Sahib, Koratagere Sub-Taluk; Lingappa, Harihar Sub-Taluk; Bhaji Rao Sindhia and Syed Sab, Kankanhalli Taluk; and Channabasava Wadayr, Devanhalli Taluk.

(b) Messrs. Yedahalli Puttanna Gowda, Tirthahalli Taluk; and Nadig Shankarappa, Shimoga Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(a) The remuneration for *totis* and *talaris* is fixed at so many seers per acre, whether there happens to be any yield or not. This is rather hard on the ryots. It is requested that either a reduction may be made in the rate or as in other places a money payment fixed on the amount of the land assessment or house-tax ordered.

Pray that the original mamool for the grant of one bundle of stalks of grain and one *kolaga* of ragi be continued.

The present acreage system of *miras* to *totis* and *talaris* is an infliction on the ryots. Government have been repeatedly requested to pay a fixed allowance instead. This may be ordered early.

(b) To do the work given by the village patel and to assist him in the discharge of Government work, it is prayed that orders may be issued for the entertainment of these village servants in villages where they do not now exist.

Mr. Abidalli Sab.—Very little of the work done by these servants is of any use to the ryots and they should therefore be paid by Government and the *miras* abolished.

Mr. D. Hanumantha Rao.—The *miras* was originally fixed by the ryots and the village servants concerned by mutual agreement. By fixing an invariable amount the ryots are now placed at a great disadvantage. The *totis* and *talaris* have benefited in several ways under the new rules. Most of them have inam lands which have greatly risen in value. As *miras* is given in kind, the increase in prices has nearly quadrupled their remuneration. In a village having 200 acres of dry land, the remuneration of *totis* according to the *miras* rules is about Rs. 60 per annum.

Reply of Government.—The Revenue Commissioner has recently submitted proposals for revising the rules regarding the payment of *miras* and the subject will be thoroughly considered.

SUBJECT No. 102.

Inam lands to Brahmins.

Messrs. Ramaswami Setty and Venkatasubbaiya, Arkalgud Taluk.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 103.

Compulsory Survey and Settlement in inam villages.

Mr. K. Tammaiya, Hassan District Board.

Summary of discussion.—Owing to internal dissensions in jodi villages the jodidars are subjected to heavy loss. It is also seen that many a jodi village is notified for sale for arrears of revenue. With a view to put an end to such a state of affairs, it is prayed that Government may be pleased to introduce Survey and Settlement to jodi villages compulsorily. When a village is taken under Government management, Survey and Settlement are introduced into it and this is in force even after the village is given back. It is not necessary therefore to insist that the consent of all the inamdars should be obtained before the Survey and Settlement are introduced.

Reply of Government.—As stated last year this cannot be done without amendment of the Land Revenue Code and several of the inamdars themselves are opposed to such a measure.

SUBJECT No. 104.

Levy of full assessment on *devadaya* and *brahmadaya* jodi or inam lands.

Mr. Channakesava Chetty, Hassan Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—*Devadaya* and *brahmadaya* lands were granted as inams by previous Maharajas and others for the use of those to whom they were granted. Now many of these inam and jodi lands have been purchased by non-Brahmins. Consequently it is only reasonable that all inam lands recently purchased by others should be assessed fully as it was not the intention of the original donors that such inam lands should be sold to others. It is prayed that needful orders may be passed in the matter.

Reply of Government.—Existing rules are sufficient. Invalid alienations when discovered are cancelled. *Brahmadaya* lands being enfranchised may be alienated.